



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,859	06/03/2005	Ikuko Yairi	7649-0001WOUS	9314
7590	01/23/2008		EXAMINER	
McCormick Paulding & Huber CityPlace II 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103-4102			CHEEMA, AZAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

6

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/519,859	YAIRI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Azam Cheema	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5,6 and 11-13 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5,6 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to the arguments filed on October 26, 2007.

Claims 11-13 have been added. Claims 5-6 and 11-13 are pending in this application.

***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the claims 5-6 have been considered. After a through examination of the present application, claims 5-6 and 11-13 are remain rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time

a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki (EP 1085484 A2) in view of Fruchterman et al. (US PAT. NO 5,470,233).

For claim 5, Nozaki teaches:

A method of supporting a self-sustained moving comprising the steps of:

inputting physical disability information and a destination from a communication terminal (see paragraph [0097], input user's specific information, starting point, destination and additional condition for route setting);

computing a guide route of a sidewalk according to the physical disability information based on the physical disability information inputted from the communication terminal and sidewalk data stored in a database (see paragraph [0005], computation based on the route information retrieved from the route computing database when the JR Kamata Station is specified as a starting point S and the Keikyu Kamata Station is specified as a destination G on a map image shown in Fig.10);

combining the computed guide route with a map data stored in the database to output it as an electronic map and displaying the electronic map showing the guide route on the communication terminal (see paragraph [0028], when the route connecting the specified starting point and destination point is to be displayed on the map image to navigate a man).

Wherein the step of computing the guide route (see paragraph [0005], computation based on the route information retrieved from the route computing database when the JR Kamata Station is specified as a starting point S and the Keikyu Kamata Station is specified as a destination G on a map image shown in Fig.10).

Nozaki has all the limitations as set forth above in claim 5, but does not explicitly teach physical disability information.

However, Fruchterman discloses includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information (see Abstract, global positioning system that helps a blind pedestrian navigate through a city and col.2, lines 59-61 and Fig.5, items 124, a blind pedestrian, of course, may be walking along a road, through an adjacent parking lot or in a valley, Appropriate for blind traveller).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the reference as correlating to the physical disability information of Fruchterman's teaching combine with Nozaki's teaching will facilitate a blind pedestrian can efficiently navigate through a maze of city streets, thereby providing him with a greater degree of independence (see col.22, lines 21-23 of Fruchterman et al).

For claim 6, note that the guide route of the electronic map displayed on the communication terminal is displayed to designate the sidewalk to be passed (see paragraph [0028], [0045], when the route connecting the specified starting point and destination point is to be displayed on the map image to navigate a man, in the case in which the facilities adapted to

the route setting condition such as user information face a road having a sidewalk provided on both sides it is possible to carry out navigation through fine route setting capable of deciding which side of the sidewalk has the facilities and utilizing the facilities without the user crossing the road, Nozaki).

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki (EP 1085484 A2) in view of Fruchterman et al (US PAT. NO 5,470,233) in further view of Kaiho et al (US PAT. NO 3,905,437).

For claim 11-Nozaki and Fruchterman do not explicitly teach wherein the physical disability information includes use of a wheelchair.

However, Kaiho et al discloses information wherein the physical disability information includes use of a wheelchair (Abstract, in a wheelchair for disable persons having side wheels with hand rims).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the reference as wherein the physical disability information includes use of a wheelchair of Kaiho's teaching combine with Nozaki's teaching to provide a wheelchair for disabled persons, which can be driven by an electric motor when it is desired, so that the climbing or descending of the wheelchair over a step is facilitated (col.1, lines 40-44 of Kaiho et al).

For claims 12-13 Nozaki and Fruchterman do not explicitly teach wherein the sidewalk data includes barrier information for moving in a wheelchair.

However, Kaiho et al discloses information wherein the sidewalk data includes barrier information for moving in a wheelchair ( col.4 ,lines 43-60 there is indicated diagrammatically the operation of the wheelchair for upwardly overriding a step 10 of, for instance, a curb of a sidewalk. In the diagram, the positions of the center of the hand-operated side wheels at different instants are indicated sequentially at A, B, and C, respectively. In this case, although the wheelchair is driven by the electric power drive, the power drive device is once elevated from the lowered state shown in FIG. 3 to the elevated position shown in FIG. 1. Then the entire wheelchair is tilted backward by, for instance, the disabled person tilting his body backward, so that the front wheel is elevated from the surface of the road, and the wheelchair is supported on the road by the side wheels the center of which is now at the point A and by the driving wheel 5 of the power drive).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the reference as wherein the sidewalk data includes barrier information for moving in a wheelchair of Kaiho's teaching combine with Nozaki's teaching to provide a wheelchair for disabled persons, which can be driven by an electric motor when it is desired, so that the climbing or descending of the wheelchair over a step is facilitated (col.1, lines 40-44 of Kaiho et al).

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant argument in claim 5 regarding Fruchterman does not teach the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information. The examiner respectfully submits in particular. Fruchterman clearly teaches the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information (see Abstract, global positioning system that helps a blind pedestrian navigate through a city and col.2, lines 59-61 and Fig.5, items 124, a blind pedestrian, of course, may be walking along a road, through an adjacent parking lot or in a valley, Appropriate for blind traveller).

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number:  
10/519,859  
Art Unit: 2166

Page 8

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azam Cheema whose telephone number is 571-270-1753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7.30a.m-5.00p.m ALT Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam Hosain can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

*AC*  
Azam Cheema  
Patent Examiner  
January 16, 2008

*Sathyanarayan Pannala*  
SATHYANARAYAN PANNALA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER